



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,619	09/29/2000	Robin T. Castell	1662-27100 (P00-2945)	9571

7590 01/23/2003

Conley Rose & Tayon
Attention Jonathan M Harris
P O Box 3267
Houston, TX 77253-3267

EXAMINER

LEA EDMONDS, LISA S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2835

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/675,619

Applicant(s)

CASTELL ET AL.

Examiner

Lisa Lea-Edmonds

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7,9,12-17,20-22,25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 12,17,22,25 and 26 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7,9,13-16,20 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The indicated allowability of claims 7, 9, 12, 13-16, 20, and 21 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to the RF antenna forming part of a company logo; the RF antenna incorporating diversity antenna technology; and/or the detachable molding element encasing the circuit card assembly and covering the recess in the computer. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow. The examiner apologizes to applicant for prematurely indicating allowable subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith, II. With respect to claims 13 and 14, the apparatus of Smith, II teaches a computer system (10, 90), comprising a system microprocessor; an expansion bus couples to the microprocessor and configured to transport data to and from at least one input/output device; an input/output device operatively coupled to the microprocessor; and an expansion port connected to the expansion bus, wherein the expansion port is configured to accept a detachable molding element (11, 21, 32, 80) housing an expansion device (13, 14, 17, 23, 24, 27, 36, 37, 46, 32) wherein the expansion device is a camera (13, 23, and 46) as claimed (see for example figures 1-17 and column 3 line 30 through column 6 line 18)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7, 16, 20, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inkinen in view of Taylor et al., and further in view of Chadima, Jr.. With respect to claims 7, 16, 20, and 21, Inkinen teaches a wireless network adapter (200) comprising wireless communication circuitry encased in a shell comprising a modulator (424) configured to produce a transmit signal suitable for conveying data on a wireless link, and a demodulator (425) configured to produce a base band signal that conveys information received via a wireless link, wherein the shell is a detachable molding element of an electronic device; and a bus connector (101) adapted to couple the wireless communication circuitry to an expansion bus when the shell is attached to an outer surface of an electronic device having an expansion bus as claimed (see for example column 4 line 13 through column 11 line 23). However, Inkinen lacks a clear teaching of the use of a radio modem as claimed. The apparatus of Taylor et al. is relied upon for its teaching of a radio modem that can be built into the host unit or attached to a host unit through a PCMCIA or similar port. The radio modem of Taylor comprises a bus interface, a base band controller, and a radio transceiver that combine to modulate data onto a radio frequency carrier signal as claimed (see for example column 6 line 20 through column 12 line 47). Inkinen also lacks a clear teaching of the antenna being shaped into a company logo as claimed. The apparatus of Chadima et al. is relied upon for its teaching of an antenna being shaped into an ornamental arrangement such as a company logo (see for example the abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2835

was made to incorporate the teachings of Taylor et al. into the teachings of Inkinen to clearly teach the use of a radio modem as claimed. Also, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the radio modem of Taylor into the radio module of Inkinen as it is well known in the art that a "modem" is a means of modulation and demodulation which allow a computer to transmit and/or receive information over a telephone line or by wireless means such as infrared (IR) or an antenna. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to shape the antenna into any ornamental arrangement so as to conceal the antenna given the teachings of Chadima et al..

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inkinen in view of Taylor et al., and further in view of Hsu et al... With respect to claim 9, Inkinen teaches a wireless network adapter (200) comprising wireless communication circuitry encased in a shell comprising a modulator (424) configured to produce a transmit signal suitable for conveying data on a wireless link, and a demodulator (425) configured to produce a base band signal that conveys information received via a wireless link, wherein the shell is a detachable molding element of an electronic device; and a bus connector (101) adapted to couple the wireless communication circuitry to an expansion bus when the shell is attached to an outer surface of an electronic device having an expansion bus as claimed (see for example column 4 line 13 through column 11 line 23). However, Inkinen lacks a clear teaching of the use of a radio modem as claimed. The apparatus of Taylor et al. is relied upon for its teaching of a radio modem that can be built into the host unit or attached to a host unit through a PCMCIA or similar port. The radio modem of Taylor comprises a bus interface, a base band controller, and a radio transceiver that combine to modulate data onto a radio frequency carrier signal as claimed (see for example column 6 line 20 through column 12 line 47). Inkinen also lacks a clear teaching of the radio modem incorporating diversity antenna technology as claimed. The

Art Unit: 2835

apparatus of Hsu et al. is relied upon for its teaching of a radio modem incorporating diversity antenna technology as claimed (see for example the abstract and column 2 lines 33-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Taylor et al. into the teachings of Inkinen to clearly teach the use of a radio modem as claimed. Also, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the radio modem of Taylor into the radio module of Inkinen as it is well known in the art that a "modem" is a means of modulation and demodulation which allow a computer to transmit and/or receive information over a telephone line or by wireless means such as infrared (IR) or an antenna. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Hsu et al. into the apparatus of Inkinen in view of Taylor to provide the user with means to link with numerous frequencies without the use of multiple antennas, thus compacting the modem and antenna.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith, II as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Steinberg et al.. With respect to claim 15, Smith, II teaches a computer system (10, 90), comprising a system microprocessor; an expansion bus couples to the microprocessor and configured to transport data to and from at least one input/output device; an input/output device operatively coupled to the microprocessor; and an expansion port connected to the expansion bus, wherein the expansion port is configured to accept a detachable molding element (11, 21, 32, 80) housing an expansion device (13, 14, 17, 23, 24, 27, 36, 37, 46, 32). However, Smith, II lacks a clear teaching of the expansion device being a biometric security device as claimed. The apparatus of Steinberg et al. is relied upon for its teaching of camera with biometric security (see for example the abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2835

was made to incorporate the teachings of Steinberg et al. into the apparatus of Smith, II to provide the user with security means.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please note the Pressler et al., Janky et al., Hollander et al., and Williams.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa Lea-Edmonds whose telephone number is 703-305-0265. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg can be reached on 703-308-4815. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3431 for regular communications and 703-305-3432 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-1782.

Lisa Lea-Edmonds
Examiner
Art Unit 2835



January 15, 2003